

MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

**CITY OF MESA**  
**MINUTES OF THE**  
**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**MAY 5, 2010**

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 5:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tim Nielsen - Chair  
Tom Bottomley  
Greg Lambright  
Dan Maldonado

MEMBERS ABSENT

Wendy LeSueur (excused)  
Craig Boswell

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis  
John Wesley  
Gordon Sheffield  
Angelica Guevara  
Debbie Archuleta  
Laura Hyneman  
Tom Ellsworth  
Wahid Alam  
Dan Filuk  
Eliot Stedman  
Others

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

### 1. Work Session:

**CASE:** Fry's Fuel Center  
1915 South Power Road

**REQUEST:** Review of a 4,961 sq. ft. fuel canopy and kiosk

### **DISCUSSION:**

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- The colors match the shopping center, they are not corporate?
- There is a lot of stucco; the canopy, the columns, the building
- Would like to see more masonry
- Provide a sample of the Textcoat
- Wants the detailing rethought
- Too boxy
- Needs reveals
- Provide photos of their other sites
- Need to be compatible without being identical
- Show truck path on next submittal

Boardmember Greg Lambright:

- Could they pop out the canopy and building so there is a shadow line?
- Change of plane is nice
- They haven't done anything to create a design; they are just four boxes built as economically as possible
- Provide photos of other sites
- Canopy needs detail, not just a paint stripe
- Pop the dark color out
- Create design with material pattern; don't just take the stone all the way up the columns
- Concern with traffic flow of the gas truck

Boardmember Dan Maldonado:

- Concerned with orientation of the gas pumps; why do they line up with the drive aisles?
- The follow up submittal needs to say Textcoat, not stucco, since there is no actual stucco

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Could there be a screed line between paint colors?
- Could they introduce something like perf-metal to break it up?
- Could they change the merchandise building to tie into the shopping center
- Maybe a hip roof on the merchandise building

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

A. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

B. Approval of the Minutes of the April 7, 2010 Meeting:

On a motion by Greg Lambright seconded by Tom Bottomley the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

C. Discuss, receive comment and recommend to City Council the following Design Review Case:

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

**CASE #:** DR10-03      **Mesa Pavilions FLMS**  
**ADDRESS:** 1455 Block of South Power Road  
**GENERAL VICINITY:** Located north of the US60 Freeway and east of Power Road  
**REQUEST:** Council Use Permit for a 90' Freeway Landmark Monument Sign (FLMS) for the existing Mesa Pavilions Shopping Center  
**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** District 6  
**OWNER:** Kimco Realty Corporation  
**APPLICANT:** Doug Atkins, Skyline Signs  
**STAFF PLANNER:** Angelica Guevara

**REQUEST:** Approval of a 90' Freeway Landmark Monument Sign

**SUMMARY:** Russel Youngs and Eliot Steadman represented the case. The applicants stated they were OK with the staff conditions and were open to revising the font for the Mesa Pavilions portion of the sign.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the Pavilions center did not have a consistent font. The font the applicant chose was taken from Superstition Springs. He suggested the font should be more contemporary like the sign itself. He did not think the font should be serif.

Boardmember Dan Maldonado agreed the font should be contemporary, he cautioned the applicants to make sure the i was visible so it would not blur with the ll's.

Boardmember Greg Lambright suggested using all capitals. The other Boardmembers agreed that was a good suggestion. It was determined the M and the P should be slightly larger.

Chair Tim Nielsen confirmed staff was conditioning a one foot recess for the pop out at the base. He was concerned with the sheet metal gauge. He did not want to see dimples in the future. He asked staffmember Guevara to explain where this project did not meet the Freeway Landmark Monument Sign Guidelines, and explained that the Design Review Board could recommend approval of deviations from the FLMS Guidelines. Chair Nielsen then thanked the applicants for not proposing an electronic message board.

Boardmember Bottomley stated if the panel at the base was going to be recessed, he thought the separation for the angled portion should be 4' wide to match the side.

Boardmember Lambright confirmed that Condition 5 was referring to the colors on the 11" X 17" elevations. He suggested using Mitsubishi or ACM so the panels would stay flat.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Tom Bottomley and seconded by Dan Maldonado that DR10-03 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the basic development of the Freeway Landmark Monument as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan except as noted below.
2. Side panels recessed with angle being 4' to match side.
3. Font to be contemporary with all caps. The M & P to be larger than the rest of the letters.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

5. Maximum sign height of 90 feet.
6. Removal of the project name "Mesa Pavilions" signage from the south elevation.
7. Provide paint chip samples that reflect the actual colors demonstrated on the colored elevations.
8. Paint the sides of the sign cabinets to match the color on the face of the cabinet.
9. The pop out on the base shall be recessed by one foot.
10. Provide a two foot space between the bottom most sign panel and the top of the base which is equal to the distance between the large sign panel (Costco Replacement) and the smaller sign panels (Sports Authority).
11. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
12. Compliance with all requirements of the Building Safety Division with regards to the issuance of building and sign permits.

**VOTE:** Passed 4 – 0

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

### D. Other business:

#### Design Guideline Discussion

Zoning Code Update. Staffmember Laura Hyneman explained changes to the Landscape Chapter for Urban Development. The Shade Requirement is 50% of the area of the sidewalk and can be accomplished in a number of different ways – trees, shade structures or building overhangs. Staff member Hyneman asked whether the board thought the 15 gallon size for trees was appropriate. Boardmembers Lambright and Maldonado stated it would depend on the species of tree, but thought the size should be at least 24" box. Mr. Lambright suggested that as an incentive, in some areas the developer should be allowed to eliminate shrubs if they plant larger trees. Boardmember Lambright suggested creating a list of trees that could be 24" box.

Staffmember Hyneman stated the guidelines will require a 7' clear zone between sidewalks, vehicular drives and plants with thorns, spines and sharp points. A 3' clear zone will be required between plants with thorns in parking lot landscape medians. Boardmember Maldonado thought that many appropriate and attractive plants had thorns and he did not want the standards to eliminate all these types of plants.

Regarding minimum sizes for tree grates or pavers set on sand Boardmember Maldonado stated there should probably a minimum square footage of 30' with a 5' minimum. He thought 5' x 6' is an appropriate minimum.

#### Discussion of the Zoning Ordinance Update

Gordon Sheffield presented a power point regarding the Employment Districts within the revised Zoning Code. He explained that the M-1 and M-2 districts will be renamed LI and GI, PEP will remain the same, and there will be a new district HI, Heavy Industrial. The new HI district will be major, intense, uses such as cement plants, and slaughter houses.

Regarding Form Requirements Mr. Sheffield explained that there will be a cafeteria style menu from which applicants will need to choose at least 2 of the 4 choices.

Regarding Infill Development Mr. Sheffield explained that there will be ID One for projects less than 5 acres and ID Two for projects greater than 2.5 acres. The sites would need to be 3 of the 7 standards from State enabling laws. The applicants would be able to negotiate not only zoning standards, but also engineering standards. For the ID Two district the applicant will be writing their own standards, including the Engineering standards, similar to the PC District.

## MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2010 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Mr. Sheffield then explained the public workshop schedule, which is available on-line.

E. Adjournment:

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta  
Planning Assistant

da